PEIPING — Lazarist Press.

On two recent reconstructions of a Sanskrit hymn transliterated with Chinese characters in the X century A. D.

By

Baron A. von Staël-Holstein.

SOCIETE ASIATIQUE 1822

The Tibetan as well as the Chinese Buddhists make a distinction between ordinary canonical texts and certain sacred formulas (Sṅags or 咒 Chou). The Emperor Ch'ien Lung expresses an ancient and generally accepted principle when, in the introduction to the collection of sacred formulas published by Imperial command, His Majesty declares that the ordinary canonical texts may be *translated* from the Indian originals into Tibetan, Chinese etc., while the Sṅags or Chou should be *transliterated* [1].

The transliteration of the sacred formulas presents no serious problem to the Tibetans, who possess a phonetic script, but it causes considerable difficulties to the Chinese. None of the numerous systems, which have been devised for the transliteration of the Indian phonetic signs with Chinese characters, could ever rightly claim to be applicable throughout China, because the phonetic value of the characters has not been the same in the different provinces for many centuries past. The fact that the pronunciation of most characters has in all parts of the country changed during the course of the centuries further complicates matters. The Emperor Ch'ien Lung realized that the Chinese characters substituted for certain Indian letters in South or Middle China many centuries ago, if read according to the XVIII century Peking fashion, represented sounds which differed considerably from the texts of the original Indian formulas.

The Monarch (or his philological advisers) knew, for instance, that the Sanskrit word deva (meaning: god), which occurs in the sacred

formulas, was transliterated 泥囉 at Loyang about 700 A. D., and consequently read ni fu by his Peking contemporaries [2].

The XVIII century Peking authorities were convinced of the inefficacy of religious ceremonies accompanied by the recitation of such badly mutilated formulas, because they believed in the dogma, accepted in India for over two millennia, that none but quite correctly recited texts could induce the supernatural powers to grant the wishes of their worshippers. Therefore a commission headed by an Imperial Prince was charged with a revision of all the sacred formulas (全咒) contained in the Chinese Buddhist canon, and the results of their labours were published in nine big volumes (套 T'ao). The Imperial commissioners succeeded fairly well in amending the Chou whenever they could find the counterparts of the formulas, transliterated with Chinese characters, in the sacred books of Tibet, which preserve most of those texts transcribed with strictly phonetic Indo-Tibetan letters. Their reconstructions were, however, much less acceptable [3] when they had nothing but the ancient Chinese transliterations [4] to work upon.

The reconstruction of the 佛說聖觀自在菩薩梵讚, for instance, at the end of which the Imperial commissioners declare that no counterpart of it is found in the Tibetan books, seems to be quite unsatisfactory, and I venture to suggest another reconstruction, which is supported by the existing Tibetan *translation* of the original Sanskrit text. The latter has evidently been lost for centuries.

The title of the Chinese *transliteration* 佛說聖觀自在菩薩梵讚, which will be shortened to KFT (觀梵讚) hereafter, means: a Sanskrit hymn (or eulogy) proclaimed by the Buddha [and addressed to] Āryāvalokiteçvarabodhisattva. The Tibetan *translation* is entitled: Ḥjig rten dbaṅ phyug la bstod pa (Lokeçvarastotra) or: a hymn (or eulogy) [addressed] to Lokeçvara [5]. Lokeçvara (meaning: the Lord of the world) is one of the many titles attributed to Āryāvalokiteçvarabodhisattva (comp. pages 2 and 12 of my article on two Tibetan pictures etc., Bulletin of the National Library of Peiping 1932).

The Chinese form of the KFT is attributed [6] to Fa T'ien (法天), an Indian Buddhist monk from Nālanda, who came to China in the X century A. D. In 982 A. D. he changed his name to Fa Hsien (法賢) and died in 1001.

The KFT consists of one purely Chinese stanza [7] and of eight Sanskrit stanzas (32 lines) transliterated with Chinese characters.

The authoress of the Sanskrit original of the Ḥjig rten dbaṅ phyug la bstod pa is, according to the Tanjur: the nun (dge sloṅ ma) Dpal mo [8], but no translators' names are given in the Tanjur in connection with the hymn.

In addition to the abbreviations MH (comp. note 1 below) and KFT (comp. page 2 of this article) I use the abbreviations W, SH and TF in the following lines. W means: the romanization of the KFT according to Williams' syllabic dictionary [9], SH means: my reconstruction of the Sanskrit text, and TF [10] means: the Tibetan translation mentioned above, which seems to prove that the majority of the lines of the KFT has been correctly explained in SH. The figures 1—32, which are not found in our sources, have been added by me in order to facilitate the comparison of the reconstructed text with the English translation.

TF	ḥjig	rten	bla	ma	sa	gsum	gyis	phyag	byas							
MH	bu	wa	nan		tra			ya	waṃ	mi	dha	lo	ka	ku	ruṃ	
KFT	部	嚩	曩		怛	囉	二合	野	晚	禰	多	路	迦	虞	隴	
W	pu	foh	nang		tah	lo		yé	wan	ni	to	lu	kia	yü	lung	[11]
SH	bhu	va	na		tra			ya	van	di	ta	lo	ka	gu	ruṃ	1

TF	lha	dbaṅ	ṣhaṅs	pa	mchog	gis	bstod	pa	ste							
MH	a	ma	la	ti	pa	ti	yuṃ			stu			ti		pra	
KFT	阿	摩	囉	地	波	底	孕	二合	窣	覩	二合		帝		沒	囉
W	o	mo	lo	ti	po	ti	yin		suh	tu			ti		muh	lo
SH	a	ma	rā	dhi	pa	tiṃ			stu				ta		bra	
										hma					va	ruṇa
								二合	憾	摩	二合		嚩		覽	
									han	mo			foh		lan	
									hma				va		raṇ	2 [12]

TF	thub	mchog	rgyal	po	myur	du	dṅos	grub	sṣol							
MH	mu	ni	rā		ja	laṃ	du	ru		wa	ji	ti	ka	laṃ		
KFT	母	你	囉	引	惹	覽	度	噌	二合	嚩	悉	地	迦	覽		
W	mu	ni	lo		jé	lan	tu	lu		foh	sih	ti	kia	lan		
SH	mu	ni	rā		ja[va]	raṃ	dhru			va	si	ddhi	ka	raṃ	3	[13]

TF spyan ras gzigs mgon mchog la phyag ḫçhal lo
MH pra ṇaṃ ma mai wa lo ki ta nā da wa laṃ
KFT 鉢囉二合 拏摩引 彌嚩路吉多曩引 他嚩覽
W poh lo na mo mi foh lu kih to nang t'a foh lan
SH pra ṇa mā *mya* va lo ki ta nā tha va raṃ 4

TF bde gçegs raṅ bzhin bdud rçiḫi ṅo bo ḫchaṅ
MH su ga ta a mṛ ta rū pa su rū pa ta
KFT 酥誐多 阿蜜里二合 多魯波酥魯波駄
W su ngo to o mih li to lu po su lu po t'o
SH su ga tā mṛ ta rū pa su rū pa dha[raṃ] 5 *14)*

TF sna çhogs mçhan gyis spras paḫi sku lus mchog
MH wa hu ra kṣa na pū ji ta mi ha wa raṃ
KFT 嚩虎洛叉拏部史多禰引賀嚩覽
W foh hu loh ch'a na pu shi to ni ho foh lan
SH ba hu la kṣa ṇa bhū ṣi ta de ha va raṃ 6 *15)*

TF gser gyi padmas g'yon gyi phyag brgyan pa
MH ka na kaṃ ja pi pu ṭa wa ma ka raṃ
KFT 迦拏建引 惹尾部史多 嚩引摩迦覽
W kia na kien jé wéi pu shi to foh mo kia lan
SH ka na kā*b* ja vi bhū ṣi ta vā ma ka raṃ 7 *16)*

TF dri med ral pa ḫkhyil nag cuṅ zad ser
MH ku ca la ma la bhyo ka ra bu ta ccha
KFT 俱胝羅引摩羅閉孕二合 誐羅冒多惹
W kü chi lo mo lo pi yin ngo lo mao to jé
SH ku ṭi lā ma la piṃ ga la *dh*au ta ja

kaṃ
知降二合
chi kiang
ṭaṃ 8 *17)*

TF zla baḫi dbyibs ḫdra gsal zhiṅ rẓogs paḫi zhal
MH ça çi bhyo ma me bho jva la pra na
KFT 舍尸尾孕二合 摩彌冒入嚩二合 羅布囉拏
W shé shi wéi yin mo mi mao juh foh la pu lo na
SH ça çi biṃ ba mi vo jjva la pū ṛṇa

mu kha
二合目欠
mu k'ien
mu khaṃ 9

TF padma ltar yaṅs mchog tu mẓes paḫi spyan
MH ka ma la ya ta lo ca naṃ ja lo va laṃ
KFT 羯摩羅引野多路左曩左引魯嚩覽
W kieh mo lo yé to lu tso nang tso lu foh lan
SH ka ma lā ya ta lo ca na cā ru va raṃ 10 *18)*

TF mkhur ba gaṅs kyi dum bu lta bur dkar
MH he ma kha nā ti pā na ra ga na pu ci kaṃ
KFT 吽摩欠拏地半拏囉嚂拏布知降二合
W hi mo k'ien na ti pan na lo yen na pu chi kiang
SH hi ma khaṃ ḍa *vi* pāṇ ḍa ra gaṇ ḍa pu ṭaṃ 11

TF ri dvags rgyal poḫi dgaḫ bzhin zhal sgros dmar
MH mṛ ka rja bi bhu ti da wa sva dha ra
KFT 蜜里二合 誐囉引惹尾冒地多嚩娑怛囉三合
W mih li ngo lo jé wéi mao ti to foh so tah lo
SH mṛ ga rā ja

yū kaṃ
瑜嚂
yü yen 12 *19)*

TF ñi ma ḫchar ka ltar dmar bçod kyi mdog
MH pra ta ma ru na rāṃ mi dha ra ca smaṃ
KFT 鉢囉二合 他摩引魯拏覽嚩多囉引惹三滿
W po lo t'a mo lu na lan 'rh to lo jé san man
SH pra tha mā ru ṇa 13 *20)*

TF padma gzhon nu lta bur mchu dmar la
MH a va ra ji ta baṃ ka mi naṃ nu smaṃ
KFT 阿 嚩 覽 儗 多 半 迦 嚕 曩 努 三 滿
W o foh lan i to pan kia 'rh nang nu san man 14

TF ston kaḥi sprin ċhogs lta bur sgra sgrogs pa
MH sva ra naṃ mu na ga me ta me gha ru da
KFT 娑 嚩 二合 囉 難 母 那 誐 嚕 多 彌 伽 魯 旦
W so foh lo nan mu na ngo 'rh to mi k'ié lu tan 21)
SH sva ra daṃ bu da ga [r]ji ta me gha ru taṃ 15

TF dpuṅ gñis sna ċhogs mċhan gyis mzes pa ste
MH wa hu la kṣa na pu ji ta sva ya ka raṃ
KFT 嚩 護 洛 叉 拏 部 史 多 娑 嚩 也 二合 迦 覽
W foh hu loh ch'a na pu shi to so foh yé kia lan 22)
SH ba hu la kṣa ṇa bhū ṣi ta sa vya ka raṃ 16

TF phyag mthil padma gzhon nu lta bur ḥjam
MH dha ru gu mā ra sva da ra pā ṇi dha raṃ
KFT 多 魯 俱 摩 羅 娑 引 馱 羅 波 引 尼 多 楞
W to lu kü mo lo so t'o lo po ni to lăng 23)
SH ta *ṇu* ko ma la sā *ra* *sa* pā ṇi ta laṃ 17

TF ri dvags pags pa sku yi stod na mnabs
MH mi ri kā jva li ma ṇi vi ṣṭi ta wa
KFT 蜜 里 二合 誐 左 里 摩 你 尾 瑟 胝 二合 多 嚩 引
W mih li ngo tso li mo ni wéi seh chi to foh
SH mṛ ga ca r ma ṇi ve ṣṭi ta vā
sva ka raṃ
娑 迦 覽
so kia lan 24)
ma ka raṃ 18

TF sñan gñis rna rgyan g'yo zhiṅ mzes pa mṅaḥ
MH ça bhaṃ gu ṇa la maṃ ni ta lu la da raṃ
KFT 戍 伴 軍 拏 羅 曼 尼 多 路 羅 馱 覽
W shu pan kiün na lo man ni to lu lo t'o lan
SH ça bha(ṃ) kuṃ ḍa la maṇ ḍi ta lo la dha raṃ 19 25)

TF phyag ni yaṅs çiṅ lte ba zab pa ste // padma dri ma med pa lta bu lags
MH vi ma laṅ ga ma lu na ra naṃ bi da raṃ
KFT 尾 摩 楞 迦 摩 路 那 嚩 曩 引 鼻 多 楞
W wéi mo lăng kia mo lu na lo nang pi to lăng
SH vi ma laṃ ka ma lo da ra nā bhi ta laṃ 20 26)

TF gser mchog ska rags nor buḥi rgyan ldan pa
MH ma ṇi mā ṇi ta mi gha ra hi ma wa ra
KFT 摩 尼 曼 尼 多 彌 佉 羅 吽 摩 嚩 覽
W mo ni man ni to mi k'ia lo hi mo foh lan
SH ma ṇi maṇ ḍi ta me kha la he ma va raṃ 21

TF na bzaḥ mzes pas sku yi smad brgyan pa
MH ga ci pi ça kci ta ci tra sva
KFT 迦 致 尾 瑟 計 二合 多 嘫 怛 嚩 二合 酥 嚩
W kia chi wéi seh ki to tsih tah lo su foh
SH ka ṭi ve ṣṭi ta ci tra su va
stri wa ra
悉 怛 嚩 三合 嚩 覽
sih tah lo foh lan
stra *dha* raṃ 22 27)

TF rgyal ba ye çes rgya mċhoḥi pha rol phyin
MH ma naṃ ga ya na ma hu na ti pa ra ga dha
KFT 嚕 曩 誐 也 二合 拏 摩 護 那 地 波 囉 誐 旦
W 'rh nang ngo yé na mo hu na ti po lo ngo tan
SH ji na jñā na ma ho da dhi pā ra ga taṃ 23 28)

TF bsod nams du ma las ni ḫkhruṅs paḥi mgon
MH ba hu bā na ya mu bā a mṛ ta
KFT 嚩 護 奔 拏 也 二合 母 波 阿 里 嚩 二合 多
W foh hu păn na yé mu po o li 'rh to
SH ba hu pu ṇya mu pā rji ta

equivalent
missing ma da pa nāṃ
囉 摩 馱 波 難
lo mo t'o po nan
ra m *ya* pa daṃ 24 *29)*

TF rims daṅ nad ḫjoms bde ba mchog bskyed pa
MH jva la wa ya ti ha laṃ wa hu su
KFT 入 嚩 二合 囉 嚩 也 二合 地 賀 覽 嚩 護 燥
W juh foh lo foh yé ti ho lan foh hu saọ
SH jva ra vyā dhi ha raṃ ba hu sau
khā ya ka ran
佉 也 二合 迦 覽
k'ia yé kia lan
khya ka raṃ 25 *30)*

TF srid pa mthar mṣad mkhaḫ la rgyu ba daṅ
MH ta li pa wa a ra da ka raṃ sva raṃ
KFT 怛 里 二合 婆 嚩 阿 囉 他 二合 迦 覽 娑 嚩 覽
W tah li p'o foh o lo t'a kia lan so foh lan
SH tri bha vā rtha ka raṃ[ca] *su* va[rgaca] raṃ 26 *31)*

TF bdud rigs sna ċhogs stobs ni ṅes par ḫjoms
MH vi vi ta gu la nri ni dha ma ra wa laṃ
KFT 尾 尾 馱 俱 羅 你 里 嚩 二合 多 摩 引 囉 嚩 楞
W wéi wéi t'o kü lo ni li 'rh to mo lo foh lăng
SH vi vi dhā ku la ni rji ta mā ra ba laṃ 27 *32)*

TF zhabs mchog rkaṅ gdub mchog gis sgra sgrogs la
MH wa rā na pra ça mi ta pa na wa raṃ
KFT 嚩 囉 努 布 囉 攝 禰 多 波 引 那 嚩 覽
W foh lo nu pu lo sheh ni to po na foh lan
SH va ra nū pu ra çab di ta pā da va raṃ 28

TF glaṅ po dregs daṅ ṅaṅ paḥi stabs su gçegs
MH ka je man ta vi laṃ mi ta haṃ sva ga tyo
KFT 誐 惹 滿 多 尾 覽 彌 多 憾 娑 誐 帝 孕 二合
W ngo jé man to wéi lan mi to han so ngo ti yin
SH ga ja man *da* vi raṃ bi ta haṃ sa ga tiṃ 29 *33)*

TF bdud rṣi chen po thugs chud yoṅs rzogs brñes
MH bha ri pu ra na ma hā amṛ ta la
KFT 波 里 布 囉 拏 二合 摩 賀 蜜 里 二合 多 羅
W po li pu lo na mo ho mih li to lo
SH pa ri pū rṇa ma hā mṛ ta la
bu ddha ga tyo
沒 馱 二合 誐 帝 孕 二合
muh t'o ngo ti yin
bdha ga tiṃ 30

TF gser bzhin rtag tu dgyes paḥi rgyan mṅaḫ ba
MH wa ra cha la ma hū na ti wa ra na traṃ
KFT 嚩 囉 剎 囉 摩 護 那 地 嚩 囉 拏 二合 馱 覽
W foh lo ch'a lo mo hu na ti foh lo na t'o lan
SH va ra kṣī ra ma ho da dhi va rṇa dha raṃ 31 *34)*

TF ri bo gru ḫzin na ni dgyes par bzhugs
MH çrī bu ddha ra ga ti ni wa sva ga raṃ
KFT 室 里 二合 布 多 羅 迦 地 你 嚩 引 娑 迦 覽
W shih li pu to lo kia ti ni foh so kia lan
SH çrī po ta la kā dhi ni vā sa ka ram 32 *35)*

I do not think that the MH reconstruction will convey any meaning to anyone, but it seems to me that my reconstruction may be translated as follows.

Translation of the SH reconstruction of the KFT.

I bow to the excellent Lord Avalokita[36] (4), the master of the universe, worshipped by the three worlds (1), the excellent Brahmā[12], the praised ruler of the immortals (2), the excellent king of the sages, who grants stable success (3), who is endowed with a beautiful appearance [i. e.] the appearance of a [true] son of the Sugata (5), whose excellent body is adorned with many marks of distinction (6), whose left hand is adorned with a golden lotus (7), whose coiled tresses are spotless and glittering [in] reddish brown [lustre] (8), whose face is radiant and full like the disc of the moon (9), whose eyes, elongated like [the petals of] lotuses, are of excellent beauty (10), the curves of whose cheeks are as white as snowflakes (11).....
whose thundering voice resembles the roaring of autumn clouds (15)[37], whose left hand is adorned with many marks of distinction (16), the palms of whose hands resemble young and tender lotus flowers (17), whose left arm wears an antelope skin (18), whose [ears], which listen to everybody, are adorned with beautiful ear-rings[38] (19), who is pure, whose navel resembles the cup of a lotus flower (20), the excellent gold of whose girdle is adorned with jewels (21), who wears a beautiful and charming garment draped round his hips (22), who has crossed the great ocean of a Buddha's wisdom (23), who, possessing much religious merit, has reached a blissful state [of eminence] (24), who, curing disease and illness, causes much happiness (25), who confers blessings on [the beings of] the three forms of existence and moves in the skies (26), who has defeated Māra's army in many encounters (27), whose excellent feet clink with beautiful foot-rings (28), whose Haṃsa-gait is slow and measured like [the step of] an elephant (29), who is in full possession of the entire great Nectar [of the Buddhist doctrine] (30), whose body is as white as the excellent milk-ocean (31), and who lives on the glorious Potalaka (32).

The learned Mongolian Lama Thabs ldan çes rab, who has spent 10 years studying in Tibet, tells me that the TF is still recited by

the monks of Lhasa. The memory of its authoress is highly respected in the capital of Tibet, and one of the Se ra monastery's most cherished possessions is a statue of Avalokita, which the Tibetans regard as a gift from the authoress of our hymn, the Buddhist nun Lakṣmī.

Ti lo pa Gegen, an important Mongolian prelate, who spent some time here in the autumn of 1934, also knows the TF, and highly appreciates its literary merits.

The question as to whether the TF deserves the prelate's praises or not, will hardly lead to heated discussions among modern philologists. They will probably attach a greater importance to the fact that Lakṣmī's poem has been transliterated with Chinese characters by Fa T'ien. In a volume (Bibl. Buddh. XV) published in 1913 I have analysed and reconstructed three other Sanskrit hymns transliterated by the same Fa T'ien (comp. notes 6 and 9 below). In the introduction to Bibl. Buddh. XV I describe the method of transliteration, which Fa T'ien uses, and at the end of the volume I give an alphabetical list of all the Chinese characters, which occur in the transliterations. Nearly all Chinese characters used in the KFT are found in that list, and in order to facilitate the comparative study of the two indices, I add the numbers (big Arabic numerals), which the characters bear in Bibl. Buddh. XV, to the characters listed in the following pages. The smaller Arabic numerals (unless otherwise specified) refer to the lines of the KFT. I ignore lines 12, 13 and 14 of the KFT as well as nearly all the notes, printed with small characters, in my list[39].

An alphabetical list of the characters used in the KFT.

4. 叉 (ch'a) represents kṣa. 6. 16.

5. 剎 (ch'ah) repres. kṣī. 31. 剎 frequently represents kṣi in Fa T'ien's transliterations. Comp. nikṣiptā°, line 50 of the Gaṇḍīstotragāthā.

8. 致 (chi) repres. ṭi. 22. 致 also occurs in the words jhaṭiti vighaṭitaṃ, line 20 of the Gaṇḍīst.

胝 (chi) repres. ṭi. 8. 18.

知 (chi) repres. ṭ. 8. 11. In both cases we find the character in the following combination: 知降二合 representing ṭaṃ.

13. 隣 (foh) repres. v, vă and ba. 1. 2. 3. 4. 4. 6. 6. 7. 9. 10. 15. 16. 16. 18. 21. 22. 24. 25. 25. 25. 26. 26. 27. 28. 28. 31. 31. 32. 隣 represents not only va etc. but also ba etc. This is probably due to the fact, that Fa T'ien's Indian manuscripts represented correct va etc. and correct ba etc. by the same Indian character. Comp. Bibl. Buddh. XV, page V. In the word dharaṃ (line 22) 隣 corresponds to dha. This is probably due to the fact that Fa T'ien frequently mistakes dh for v. Comp. note 17 below. 隣 occurs twice in line 22.

15. 憾 (han) repres. h and haṃ. 2. 29.

16. 哂 (hi) repres. hi and he. 11. 21.

18. 賀 (ho) repres. hă. 6. 25. 30.

20. 護 (hu) repres. hu and ho. 16. 23. 24. 25. 31.

虎 (hu) repres. hu. 6.

28. 惹 (jé) repres. ja. 3, 7. 8. 29.

29. 入 (juh) repres jj and j. 9. 25.

35. 計 (ki) corresponds to ṭi. 22.

38. 迦 (kia) repres. kă. 1. 3. 7. 7. 16. 18. 20. 22. 25. 26. 32. 32.

39. 佉 (k'ia) repres. kh and kha. 21. 25.

41. 降 (kiang) repres. aṃ. 8. 11. Comp. 知.

43. 伽 (k'ié) repres. gha. 15.

44. 羯 (kieh) repres. ka. 10.

46. 建 (kien) corresponds to kāb in line 7. Comp. note 16 below.

49. 欠 (k'ien) repres. khaṃ. 9. 11.

吉 (kih) repres. ki. 4.

軍 (kiün) repres. kuṃ. 19.

56. 俱 (kü) repres. ku and ko. 8. 17. 27.

62. 覽 (lan) repres. raṃ and ram. 2. 3. 3. 4. 6. 7. 10. 16. 18. 19. 21. 22. 25. 25. 26. 26. 28. 29. 31. 32.

64. 楞 (lăng) repres. laṃ. 17. 20. 20. 27.

67. 里 (li) repres. ṛ, r and rĭ. 5. 18. 18. 24. 26. 27. 30. 30. 32.

77. 羅 (lo) repres. lă. 8. 8. 8. 9. 10. 17. 19. 19. 21. 27. 30. 32. The second 羅 in line 17 corresponds to sa. Comp. note 23 below.

78. 囉 (lo) repres. r and ră. 1. 2. 2. 3. 4. 9. 11. 15. 20. 22. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 28. 30. 31. 31. 31.

80. 洛 (loh) repres. la in the word lakṣaṇa. 6. 16. Comp. line 7 of the Mañjuçrīnāmāṣṭaçataka, Bibl. Buddh. XV, page 88.

81. 路 (lu) repres. lo. 1. 4. 10. 19. 20.

82. 嚕 (lu) repres. ru. 3.

83. 魯 (lu) repres. rŭ. 5. 5. 10. 15. In line 17 魯 corresponds to nu. Comp. note 23 below.

85. 隴 (lung) corresponds to ruṃ (line 1). Comp. note 11 below.

87. 曼 (man) repres. maṇ. 19. 21.

89. 滿 (man) repres. man. 29.

91. 冒 (mao) repres. vo. 9. 冒 corresponds to dhau in line 8. Comp. note 17 below.

94. 彌 (mi) repres. me, mi and bi. 9. 15. 21. 29. In line 4 彌 corresponds to mya.

蜜 (mih) repres. m (before ṛ). 5. 18. 30.

97. 摩 (mo) repres. mă. 2. 2. 4. 7. 8. 10. 11. 17. 18. 20. 20. 21. 21. 23. 24. 27. 30. 31. In line 9 摩 corresponds to ba.

102. 母 (mu) repres. mu and bu. 3. 15. 24.

104. 目 (muh) repres. mu. 9.

105. 沒 (muh) repres. b in the words brahma (line 2) und labdha (line 30).

107. 那 (na) repres. da. 15. 20. 23. 28. 31.

108. 拏 (na) repres. ṇ, ṇa and ḍa. 4. 6. 9. 11. 11. 11. 16. 19. 24. 30. 31. 拏 corresponds to na in lines 7 and 23. This may be due to misspellings in Fa T'ien's Indian manuscript.

116. 難 (nan) repres. daṃ. 15. 24.

117. 曩 (nang) repres. nă. 1. 4. 10. 20. 23.

121. 誐 (ngo) repres. ga. 5. 8. 15. 18. 23. 29. 29. 30. In line 23 the characters 誐 也 二合 correspond to jñā. Comp. note 28 below. 誐 occurs twice in line 23.

122. 禰 (ni) repres. di and de. 1. 6. 28.

123. 你 (ni) repres. ni. 3. 18. 27. 32.

125. 尼 (ni) repres. ṇi. 17. 21. 尼 corresponds to ḍi in the word maṇḍita (lines 19 and 21).

135. 努 (nu) repres. nū. 28.

138. 阿 (o) repres. ă. 2. Tā is represented by 多 阿 in line 5, pā by 波 阿 in line 24, and vā ba 嚩 阿 in line 26.

139. 半 (pan) repres. păṇ. 11.

伴 (pan) corresponds to bha. 19.

141. 奔 (păn) repres. pu. 24.

143. 鼻 (pi) repres. bhi. 20.

144. 閉 (pi) repres. pi. 8.

146 波 (po) repres. pă. 2. 5. 5. 17. 23. 24. 24. 28. 30.

149. 婆 (p'o) repres. bha. 26.

151. 鉢 (poh) repres. p. 4.

152. 布 (pu) repres. pŭ and po. 9. 11. 28. 30. 32.

154. 部 (pu) repres. bhŭ. 1. 6. 7. 16.

156. 嚕 ('rh) repres. ji. 15. 23. 24. 27.

燥 (sao) repres. sau. 25.

167. 瑟 (seh) repres. ṣ. 18. 22.

173. 舍 (shé) repres. ça. 9.

攝 (sheh) repres. çab. 28. According to Professor Karlgren's analytic dictionary, the "ancient Chinese" pronunciation of 攝 is śi̯äp.

177. 尸 (shi) repres. çi. 9.

179. 史 (shi) repres. ṣi. 6. 7. 16.

182. 室 (shih) repres. ç. 32.

185. 戍 (shu) repres. çu. 19.

190. 悉 (sih) repres. s and si. 3. 22.

191. 娑 (so) repres. s and să. 15. 16. 17. 29. 32. 娑 corresponds to ma in line 18. This may be due to the fact that the Indian letter representing ma is very similar to the Indian letter representing sa in a number of alphabets. I cannot explain why 娑 corresponds to su in line 26.

192. 蘇 (su) repres. su. 5. 5. 22.

197. 窣 (suh) repres. s. 2.

199. 他 (t'a) repres. tha. 4. 26.

200. 怛 (tah) repres. t. 1. 22. 22. 26.

204. 旦 (tan) repres. taṃ. 15. 23.

210. 底 (ti) repres. ti. 2.

211. 地 (ti) repres. dhi and ddhi. 2. 3. 23. 25. 31. 32. In line 11 地 corresponds to vi. Comp. note 17 below.

212. 帝 (ti) repres. ti. 29. 30. I cannot explain why 帝 corresponds to ta in line 2.

217. 多 (to) repres. ta. 1. 4. 5. 5. 6. 7. 8. 10. 15. 16. 17. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 24. 27. 28. 29. 29 30. 32. The first 多 in line 29 corresponds to da.

218. 馱 (t'o) repres. dhă. 5. 17. 19. 27. 30. 31. In line 24 馱 corresponds to ya. Comp. note 29 below.

222. 度 (tu) repres. dh. 3.

覩 (tu) repres. tu. 2.

233. 唧 (tsih) repres. ci. 22.

235. 左 (tso) repres. ca. 10. 10. 18.

241. 晚 (wan) repres. van. 1.

243. 尾 (wei) repres. vi, ve and bi. 7. 9. 18. 20. 22. 27. 27. 29.

248. 也 (yé) repres. yă. 16. 24. 25. 25. In line 23 the characters 誐也二合 correspond to jñā. Comp. note 28 below.

250. 野 (yé) repres. ya 1. 10.

255. 嶽 (yen) repres. gaṇ. 11.

263. 孕 (yin) repres. ṃ at the end of some words. 2. 8. 9. 29. 30. Comp. PSK, pages 186 and 187.

269. 虞 (yü) repres. gu. 1.

I venture to hope that this index and the one, which I published in 1913 (Bibl. Buddh. XV, pages 161—189), will be of some use to those, who are interested in the ancient pronunciations of the Chinese characters. The exploitation of the numerous Indo-Chinese transliterations for the history of the Chinese language has begun long ago, and we find many references to such transliterations in the writings of modern sinologues. One of the most interesting treatises, dealing with Indo-Chinese transliterations, is undoubtedly Professor Maspero's "Le dialecte de Tch'ang-Ngan sous les T'ang" (BEFEO, volume XX, pages 1—124), but in addition to perfectly assured reconstructions it contains some suggestions, which are not entirely convincing. We know from one of the indices (Bibl. Buddh. XV, page 164) mentioned above that the character 曳 renders the Indian syllables yi, ye and yai in two of the hymns transliterated by Fa T'ien, and the fact that Prof. Maspero (page 32) regards it as representing ya (in 舍枳也(二合)牟曩曳 = Çākyamunaya) attracts our attention [40]. Quite apart from the fact that 曳 represents ye (not ya) in transliterations dating from the X century A. D., it should be noted that Çākyamunaye is more likely to occur in the sacred texts than Çākyamunaya. The phrase namo bhagavate Çākyamunaye tathāgatāya is found in many sūtras. We do not know the context of the syllables 舍枳也(二合)牟曩曳 quoted by Professor Maspero, and he does not favour us with any indications as to why the reconstruction Çākyamunaya is suggested, but he gives us the source of the truly remarkable "Sanskrit" word sarvadevatābhiṣkṛtya in his treatise

(page 28). Sarvadevatābhiṣkṛtya is, according to the noted author, a correct reconstruction of the syllables 薩婆提婆多(引)毗(重)色訖底[41]. The corresponding passage of the Kanjur, however, clearly proves that the Chinese characters 薩婆 etc. represent sarvadevatābhiṣikte and that Prof. Maspero's reconstruction is wrong. Those, who attempt the reconstruction of Sanskrit words preserved in Chinese transliterations, should certainly not neglect[42] the sacred books of Tibet.

Notes to the article on two recent reconstructions of a Sanskrit hymn transliterated with Chinese characters in the X century A. D.

Note 1.

Most Chou are invocations of Buddhas, gods, or other supernatural powers, and their length varies considerably. Some of them consist of a few syllables only, while others cover several printed pages.

The fact that some Sanskrit texts have been preserved to us in Chinese or Tibetan *transliterations* as well as in *translations* is, in most cases, probably due to the different authorities' disagreeing as to the status (Chou or no Chou) of the passages in question. There is however at least one text (the Trikāyastava) which is said to have been transliterated as well as translated into Chinese by the same scholar. Comp. my Bemerkungen zum Trikāyastava, Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg 1911, pages 837—845, and my article on a Peking, a St. Petersburg, and a Kyōto reconstruction of a Sanskrit stanza transcribed with Chinese characters under the Northern Sung dynasty. The last named article, which I designate with the letters PSK hereafter, appeared in the Ts'ai Yüan P'ei memorial volume published by the Academia Sinica in 1932 (page 175—187).

The collection of sacred formulas published by Imperial command under Ch'ien Lung bears the following Chinese title: 御製滿漢蒙古西番合璧大藏全咒, which I shorten to MH (滿漢) hereafter. Some passages found in the MH are discussed in the PSK.

Note 2.

The modern Peking pronunciation of the characters 泥嚩 is ni fu, and I presume that the XVIII century Peking reading was the same. The Kan-on of 泥 is dei, and the Go-on of 縛 is baku. Comp. Karlgren, Études sur la Phonologie Chinoise, pages 744 and 893. The K'ang Hsi dictionary gives various fan ch'ieh for 嚩 (無可 etc.), but it also contains the statement that 嚩 has the sound of 縛. The characters 泥嚩 representing the Sanskrit word deva occur in the seventh chüan of the 大寶

寶積經 (Mahāratnakūṭasūtra, Taishō Trip. XI, 37a, 20), and the corresponding Tibetan text, which contains a *transliteration* of the formula with strictly phonetic letters, was evidently found by the Imperial commissioners in the Kanjur. On line 6 of page 102b of volume ÇHI of the 1692 Kanjur the word deva corresponds to the characters 泥囉 of the Chinese text, and the Imperial commissioners corrected the reading of the sacred formula accordingly. They state in their collection of sacred formulas (T'ao N° 1, fasc. N° 1, page 42a) in Tibetan characters that *deva* is the correct reading and also give a new Chinese transliteration of the word: 德幹 (tê wa).

In an article, which has already been printed and which will form part of the forthcoming third volume of the Harvard Sino-Indian Series, I describe a copy of the Kanjur, which must have been printed in A. D. 1692. The title of the article is: On a Peking edition of the Tibetan Kanjur, which seems to be unknown in the West.

Note 3.

In a previous article (PSK) I have tried to prove in a roundabout way that the Imperial commissioners were wrong in their reconstruction of certain invocations, *the originals of which are lost*. Since that article appeared I have examined the Ch'ien Lung reconstruction of three stanzas of the Trikāyastava, the Sanskrit text of which has (unknown to the commissioners) been *preserved* in the strictly phonetic Tibetan script (not only in the Chinese transliteration, on which the commission's reconstruction is based).

The following is the Sanskrit text of the three stanzas as preserved in a strictly phonetic Tibetan transliteration and as reconstructed (also in Tibetan letters) by the Imperial commissioners (MH volume 7, fasc. 8, pages 11a—15a).

Yo naiko nāpy anekaḥ svaparahitamahāsaṃpadādhārabhūto [1]
yo naku ṇapi nika sparahetamahāsambhanadharabutu

naivābhāvo na bhāvaḥ kham iva samaraso durvibhāvasvabhāvaḥ [2]
navapa u na pawa kam ewa smarasu narapipawasabhawa

nirlepaṃ nirvikāraṃ çivam asamasamaṃ vyāpinaṃ niṣprapañcaṃ [3]
nṛripa niripikrana çiwam asamasamana mipina niprabhañja

SOCIETE ASIATIQUE 1822

vande pratyātmavedyaṃ tam aham anupamaṃ dharmakāyaṃ
mami pratetumamidyaṃ tam aham anupamaṃ dharmakāya
jinānāṃ [4]
minanāṃ

lokātītām acintyāṃ sukṛtaçataphalām ātmano yo vibhūtiṃ [5]
rukatitam acinti sukṛtasamahāram addumanu ye pibuti

parṣaṃmadhye vicitrāṃ prathayati mahatīṃ dhīmatāṃ prītihetoḥ [6]
parçānumati pikitraṃ sadhabayati mahāti dīmataṃ piritihetu

buddhānāṃ sarvalokaprasṛtam aviratodārasaddharmaghoṣaṃ [7]
buddhanaṃ sarvalokapraçritam apiradhunarasadharmakuçvaṃ

vande saṃbhogakāyaṃ tam aham iha mahādharmarājyapratiṣṭhaṃ [8]
maṃmi sambugakyaṃ dham ahām iha mahādharmalamiyaṃpratiṣṭha

sattvānāṃ pākahetoḥ kvacid anala ivābhāti yo dīpyamānaḥ [9]
satvanāṃ bhagahetu heṭin anaṃra yewapaddhi yo nipimana

saṃbodhau dharmacakre kvacid api ca punar dṛçyate yaḥ
saṃbhudhǫ dharmacakṛ kṣeṭit api ja bunara triçati ya
praçāntaḥ [10]
praçadhaṃ

naikākārapravṛttaṃ tribhavabhayaharaṃ viçvarūpair upāyair [11]
nāgakarapramuritaṃ dribhawabhyaharaṃ piçurupir upaya

vande nirmāṇakāyaṃ daçadiganugataṃ taṃ mahārthaṃ munīnām [12]
mami niriwānugaya naçamiganugataṃ tāṃ mahāryaṃ manina

Comp. my "Bemerkungen zum Trikāyastava" mentioned above (note 1). In romanizing the Tibetan alphabet I generally follow the system adopted in vol. XV (page XI) of the Bibl. Buddh., but whenever I have to deal with Sanskrit words transcribed with Tibetan letters I use c, ch and j instead of ç, ṣh and ẓ (and occasionally v instead of b) in this article. I do not repeat here what I have said in the Bemerkungen concerning certain slight mistakes in the Sanskrit text of the stanzas of the Trikāyastava, which I have corrected.

Professor Sylvain Lévi has in 1896 (Revue de l'histoire des religions, vol. XXXIV) published an almost perfect reconstruction of the Trikāyastava, which is based on the ancient Chinese *transliteration* and a Chinese *translation* only. The reconstruction is accompanied by a French translation. In my Bemerkungen I discuss Lévi's article as well as two Tibetan translations and the original Sanskrit text discovered by myself.

Note 4.

Only a comparatively very small number of sacred formulas has been preserved by the Chinese in Indian letters (悉曇字 hsi t'an tzŭ) as well as in transliterations with Chinese characters.

Note 5.

Two statements, which we find in the MH, seem to be contradictory. 1) At the beginning of their reconstruction of the KFT the commissioners state that the Tibetan title of the work is: Rgyal bas gsuṅs paḫi ḫjig rten dbaṅ phyug la bstod paḫi gzuṅs. The name of the saint used in this title is the Tibetan equivalent of Lokeçvara, not the Tibetan equivalent of Avalokiteçvara, a translation of which we find in the Chinese title 佛說聖觀自在菩薩梵讚. The facts that the Tibetan title is evidently not a translation of the Chinese title and that it contains the name Ḫjig rten dbaṅ phyug (Lokeçvara) suggest that the Ḫjig rten dbaṅ phyug la bstod pa (Lokeçvarastotra) was known to the commissioners. 2) At the end of their reconstruction of the KFT the commissioners declare categorically that the preceding hymn does not appear [at all] (mi snaṅ) in the Tibetan books. Comp. PSK, page 183.

On many pages of the MH we find the note: bod dpe la sṅags kyi don bod skad du bsgyur yod (the Tibetan book contains a Tibetan translation [not a transliteration] of the formula).

We find the Ch'ien Lung reconstruction of the KFT on leaves 61—69 of the 8th fasc. of the 7th volume (t'ao) of the MH.

Note 6.

Comp. Nanjio's catalogue, column 451. In addition to the KFT Fa T'ien is supposed to have transliterated a number of hymns, three of wich I analysed in a volume published in 1913. Those transliterations contain mistakes,

which prove that they were made by a person (or persons) very imperfectly acquainted with the Sanskrit language. Comp. Bibl. Buddh. vol. XV, page VII, and page 26 of this article. The transliterations were probably made by some of Fa T'ien's students, whose Sanskrit studies were still in an embryonic state.

Note 7.

The purely Chinese stanza, which precedes the transliterated stanzas, consists of the following Chinese characters.

歸 命 佛 法 僧
頂 禮 觀 自 在
我 今 稱 讚 彼
大 悲 功 德 林

Translation of the preceding stanza:

Having taken refuge in the Buddha, the Dharma and the Saṅgha and having worshipped Avalokiteçvara, I now praise him who is a mass of great compassion and virtue.

It should be noted that there is no counterpart of the purely Chinese stanza in the Tibetan translation of our hymn. Therefore I believe that Nanjio (cat. N° 1078) is wrong in regarding the purely Chinese stanza as a translation. It is probably an original Chinese composition, which serves as a kind of introduction, and I do not take it into account in numbering the lines of the KFT.

The purely Chinese stanza is followed by the words 梵讚第一 (meaning: the first Sanskrit eulogy) and the remaining seven transliterated stanzas are introduced by the words 梵讚第二 (meaning: the second Sanskrit eulogy) etc. I omit the characters 梵讚第 — etc. in the present edition of the KFT.

The text of the KFT printed in this article is based upon the Tōkyō Meiji ed. of the Chinese Trip. (vol. 成 fasc. 13), the Taishō ed. of the Chinese Trip. (vol. XX), and the Lung Tsang ed. of the Chinese Trip. (vol. 言 fasc. 7). Comp. PSK, page 182, where some data connected with the Lung Tsang edition are given.

Note 8.

Cordier (Fonds tibétain, vol. II, page 304, N° 34) gives Lakṣmī as the Indian name of the authoress.

We find the text of the Hjig rten dbaṅ phyug la bstod pa on pages 157a—157b of the volume Rgyud ÑU of the Narthang edition of the Tanjur and on pages 107a—107b of the volume Rgyud NU of the Coni (or Cone) edition of the Tanjur.

Between the Tibetan title and line 1 we find the following words (in both editions of the Tanjur): ḥjig rten dbaṅ phyug la phyag ḥcḥal lo [namo Lokeçvarāya], which have no counterpart in the KFT. In the Narthang ed. the line ri bo gru ḥzin etc. (comp. page 9 above) is followed by the words: ḥjig rten dbaṅ phyug la bstod pa // dge sloṅ ma dpal mos mṣad pa rzogs so. The Coni Tanjur has khyed la rab tu bstod instead of la bstod pa. As far as I know, quite (or nearly) complete copies of the Peking Tibetan Tanjur (catalogued by Cordier) can be found in Paris and in St. Petersburg (Leningrad), but I have not succeeded in finding one in Peking.

Note 9.

I now generally follow Giles in romanizing the Chinese characters, but I give the modern sounds of the characters used in the KFT according to Williams, because I used his dictionary while analysing the Chinese transliterations of the Gaṇḍīstotragāthā and two other hymns edited by myself in 1913 (Bibliotheca Buddhica XV).

I give no romanization of the characters printed with small type in the KFT. The characters printed with small type are not intended to be pronounced during the recitation of our hymn. They are mere notes indicating how the preceding big characters are to be read. 二合 means that the preceding two characters stand for one syllable, 三合 means that the preceding three characters represent one syllable, and 引 means that the vowel of the preceding syllable is long. Comp. PSK, pages 178 and 186 (note 19), Bibl. Buddh. XV, page IV, Actes du dixième congrès international des orientalistes, deuxième partie, Leide 1895, pages 189—190, and Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, vol. XX, page 27.

I have already pointed out that the note 引 is very often omitted in the transliterations ascribed to Fa T'ien in the places, where we should expect to find it. All the notes are frequently ignored in the reconstructions compiled by the Ch'ien Lung commissioners. Comp. Bibl. Buddh. XV, page IV, and PSK, page 184 (note 12).

The authors of the MH evidently began by fixing their reconstructions

with Tibetan letters and later added Manchu, Chinese and Mongolian transliterations to the "amended" Sanskrit texts written with Tibetan letters. I ignore almost all those Manchu, Chinese and Mongolian characters in this article. Comp. PSK, page 183 (note 9).

Note 10.

I refer to the Tibetan translation of the Lokeçvarastotra by the letters TF (Tibetan text the first), because I have found two other Tibetan translations from Sanskrit, which, though not as closely related to the KFT as the TF, have many features in common with it. With the letters TS I designate in this article the Dpal ḥphags pa spyan ras gzigs dbaṅ phyug la bstod pa (Cordier, vol II, page 306, N° 43) and with the letters TT the Ḥphags pa spyan ras gzigs dbaṅ phyug la bstod pa (Cordier, vol. II, page 306, N° 45). The Sanskrit titles of the works as given by Cordier (and with insignificant differences by the two Tanjur editions) are: Çrīāryāvalokiteçvarasya stuti nāmā and Āryāvalokiteçvarasya stotra. The authoress of the Sanskrit original of the TS is the nun Zla mṣes (Cordier thinks that the corresponding Sanskrit name is Candraçrī), and the Sanskrit original of the TT is ascribed to the nun Dpal mo [Lakṣmī], who is also supposed to have composed the Sanskrit original of the TF. The TS is found on leaves 178 and 179 of the volume Rgyud ÑU of the Narthang Tanjur, and on leaves 113 and 114 of the volume Rgyud NU of the Coni Tanjur. The TT is found on leaves 179 and 180 of the volume Rgyud ÑU of the Narthang Tanjur and on leaves 125 and 126 of the volume Rgyud NU of the Coni Tanjur. I give a few data connected with the Coni Tanjur edition in the preface (pages V—VI) to my edition of a commentary to the Kāçyapaparivarta, which has been published jointly by the National Library of Peking and the National Tsinghua University, Peking 1933. Laufer regards Cone (not Coni) as the correct name of the place, where the Tanjur (and the Kanjur) was printed. Comp. Laufer's preface to Filchner's "Kumbum Dschamba Ling" (Leipzig 1933), page VIII.

Note 11.

In the Saptajinastava the Skt. syllable ruṃ (in guruṃ) is transliterated thus: 龍勇二合, and in the Mañjuçrīnāmāṣṭaçataka the character 隴 represents Skt. ru (in mañjuçrīr uttamaçriyā). These facts suggest that

the members of Fa T'ien's group of Chinese Buddhists pronounced both characters (龍 and 隴) lu (not lung). Therefore the transliteration of ruṃ in line 1 of the KFT by 隴 attracts our attention. The fact that ruṃ corresponds to 隴 may, however, be due to Fa T'ien's overlooking a dot (representing the anusvāra) in his Indian manuscript. Comp. PSK, page 186, and Bibl. Buddh. XV, pages 69 and 88.

Note 12.

The comparative study of a number of Sanskrit-Chinese transliterations ascribed to Fa T'ien (comp. above pages 2 and 11) enables us in most cases to reconstruct the Indian syllables, which Fa T'ien *intended* to transribe with Chinese characters in the KFT. But the Indian syllables, which Fa T'ien wanted to transliterate, are not always correct. Some of these mistakes may be due to errors, which Fa T'ien's Indian manuscript contained. In a number of cases, however, Fa T'ien's transliterations are evidently founded on erroneous interpretations of his Indian manuscript. Furthermore the KFT contains some mistakes, which must be due to the negligence of Chinese scribes. Wherever I disagree with the KFT as we have it, I indicate the disagreement by cursive characters or by brackets. Round brackets mean that I consider the enclosed letter a superfluous addition, and square brackets that I regard an insertion as necessary.

In line 2 Fa T'ien evidently wanted to transliterate stutibrahmavaraṃ, which does not seem to yield any acceptable meaning. I suggest the reading stutabrahmavaraṃ. I call the person, who transribed our hymn with Chinese characters in the X century "Fa T'ien" merely because this is the name, which Chinese tradition connects with the KFT. I do not think that an Indian monk from Nālanda can actually be held responsible for the mistakes made in the transliteration. Comp. note 6 above, and Bibl. Buddh. XV, page VII. Mr. R. Kambayashi (Journal of the Taishō University, volume VI—VII, page 245) says: the work of reducing the Chinese transcriptions to Sanskṛt is extremely difficult, for the Chinese transcriptions have almost all been very roughly made.

The Tōkyō editions (Meiji and Taishō) of the Chinese Tripiṭaka ascribe the KFT to 法賢 and the Lung Tsang edition ascribes it to 法天. Messrs. J. Takakusu and K. Watanabe (Hōbōgirin, Fascicule Annexe, page 138) as well as B. Nanjio (Catalogue, column 450) believe that 法賢 (Fa Hsien) and 法天 (Fa T'ien) are two different names of the same person, but Mr.

Ono (小野玄妙) has not long ago published a treatise, in which he expresses the opinion that the names 法賢 and 法天 designate two different persons. I know only by hearsay of this treatise, which is said to have appeared in the 佛典之研究, and I therefore still consider 法賢 and 法天 as two names of one person for the purposes of the present article. I have not succeeded in finding in Peking a copy of Mr. Ono's treatise.

The Tibetan line contains possible equivalents of all the Skt. words forming line 2 (lha dbaṅ=amarādhipatiṃ, ṭhaṅs pa=brahma, mchog=varaṃ, bstod pa=stuti or stuta), but the Tibetan construction is somewhat different from the Sanskrit construction in this line as well as in a number of other lines. I believe that the different construction is, in most of such cases, due to the negligence of the Tibetan translators. I think that the Skt. line, on which line 2 of TF is based, was certainly identical with line 2 of SH.

In the Mañjuçrīnāmāṣṭaçataka we find the following passage: Somas tvaṃ ca Bṛhaspatiḥ..... tvaṃ Viṣṇus (thou art Soma and Bṛhaspati..... thou art Viṣṇu). Just as the Bodhisattva Mañjuçrī is identified, in this passage, with the gods Soma, Bṛhspati and Viṣṇu, so the Bodhisattva Avalokita is identified with Brahmā in our line 2. Comp. Bibl. Buddh. XV, page 93.

Note 13.

The Tibetan line seems to be founded on the reading kṣiprasiddhikaraṃ (instead of dhruvasiddhikaraṃ). Both readings fit the context as well as the metre (Toṭaka) of our hymn. Comp. Apte's Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary (third edition, Bombay 1924, page 1035), according to which "the vowel may be short by a sort of poetical licence" before pra.

Note 14.

The Skt. manuscripts, on which the KFT and the TF are based, must both have read sugatāmṛta°, but the translator of the TS must have read sugatātmaja°. The following is the corresponding line of the TS:

gzugs mẓes bde bar gçegs paḫi sras poḫi ṭhul ḫẓin ciṅ.

I prefer the reading sugatātmaja° to the first one, which does not seem to fit the context and I translate the line accordingly. The great Bodhisattvas, Avalokita etc., are of course the Buddha-sons (sugatātmaja)

par excellence and the outward appearance of all of them is identical in many respects. The ornaments, which the different great Bodhisattvas wear, are the same in most cases, but the positions of their hands and the colours of their skins vary. Comp. Grünwedel, Mythologie, pages 119, 126 and 138.

Note 15.

Between the lines sna ċhogs etc. and gser gyi etc. TF inserts the following line:

bde gċegs ḫod dpag med paḫi dbu rgyan can,

which has no counterpart in the KFT. This line evidently refers to the representation of the Buddha Amitābha, which adorns Avalokita's crown. Comp. Grünwedel, Mythologie, page 127. Those who are not acquainted with this iconographic detail would probably translate the Tibetan line as follows: who is endowed with the crown of the Sugata Amitābha.

Note 16.

My translation is based upon the reading kanakābja° (TF: gser gyi padmas). Fa T'ien has probably mistaken the reading kanakābja° of his Indian manuscript for kanakāñja°.

Note 17.

Fa T'ien frequently mistakes dh for b (or v) and vice versa (comp. Bibl. Buddh, vol. XV, pages V—VII). I suggest that he has mistaken the word dhauta in line 8 for bauta and consequently transliterated it with the characters 冒多. In the Chinese transliteration of the Gaṇḍīstotragāthā the characters 冒馱南引 correspond to the Tibetan syllables saṅs rgyas pa rnams kyi, an exact equivalent of Skt. bauddhānāṃ. Comp. Bibl. Buddh. XV, 34.

The following two lines correspond to our line 8 in the TS and in the TT:

dri med dmar ser ral pa gya gyu du ba ḫdra (TS)
dri zhim ral paḫi phreṅ ba dmar ser ḫkhyug pa po (TT).

Note 18.

In the Gaṇḍīstotragāthā the beautiful eyes of Māra's female emissaries are described as kamaladalanibha, resembling lotus petals. Comp. Bibl. Buddh. XV, page 13.

Note 19.

The line, which Fa T'ien wanted to transliterate, is evidently the following:

mṛgarājavibodhitavastrayugaṃ.

Mṛgarāja corresponds to ri dvags rgyal po. Zhal suggests that vastra should be changed into vaktra, but even this emendation alone would not enable us to give a satisfactory translation of the line. In the TS we find the following line:

zhal gyi sbubs nas ri d[v]ags rgyal poḫi ṅa ro daṅ [18].

Comp. note 21 below, where line N° 19 of the TS is given.

Line 18 of the TS may be founded upon the following Sanskrit line:

mṛgarājavirāvitavaktrayujaṃ,

possessed of a mouth, which utters sounds resembling the roaring of a lion. The TF line ri dvags etc. contains a syllable (dgaḫ), which is incomprehensible here, and seems to be founded upon a different reading.

Note 20.

I have not found the character 斡 in Williams' dictionary, but its phonetic value is indicated in a note to the Saptajinastava as being equal to man (牟 敢 切). Comp. Bibl. Buddh. XV, page 80.

The TF seems to contain an equivalent of prathamāruṇa (ñi ma ḫchar ka). In the TT we find the following lines:

mżes paḫi ḫod zer skya reṅs dmar pos brgyan pa po
padmaḫi mċho ltar phyag ni dmar bar byas pa po.

Skya reṅs may also be regarded as an equivalent of prathamāruṇa, and dmar bar byas pa po may represent °raṃgita (覽儗多, KFT 14). The Narthang Tanjur has padmar mċhuṅs pas phyad instead of padmaḫi mċho ltar phyag (Coni).

Note 21.

I base my translation on the reading çaradaṃbuda° because the

TF (ston kaḥi sprin ç̣hogs) and the TS must have read çaradaṃbuda°:
ston kaḥi chu ẖẓin ẖbrug gi sprin sgra sgrogs bzhin (TS 19).

The more or less corresponding verse of the TT contains the syllables ston kaḥi sprin.

Fa T'ien must have read svaradaṃbuda°. This reading, though possible, is not quite satisfactory, because we need not be told that a roaring (garjita) cloud emits sounds (svarad).

Note 22.

The TT contains the following line:
rin chen maṅ pos dpuṅ pa gñis ni brgyan pa po.

The jewels (rin chen) mentioned in the TT are probably the armlets which the great Bodhisattvas wear on both arms. Comp. Grünwedel, Mythologie, pages 122, 123 and 127. According to the TF Avalokita's arms are adorned with many marks or symbols. From the KFT we learn that Avalokita's left hand is endowed with many marks or symbols. This may refer to emblems such as the dharmacakra, representations of which are supposed to be seen on the palms of some Buddhist saints. In a hymn addressed to Mañjughoṣa (Ḥjam dbyaṅs mñes par byed paḥi bstod sprin rgya mç̣ho) Ç̣oṅ kha pa, the great reformer, mentions the golden wheel, which adorns the palms (phyag daṅ zhabs kyi mthil) of the saint.

Note 23.

Fa T'ien evidently wanted to transliterate the following syllables: tarukomalasādhalapāṇitalaṃ, which do not seem to yield any reasonable meaning. The words forming the SH line are all represented in the TF: tanu = gzhon nu, komala = ẖjam, sārasa = padma, and pāṇitalaṃ = phyag mthil. The fifteenth line of the TS

sku daṅ phyag mthil padmaḥi ẖdab ltar çin tu mñen

too contains equivalents of all the words forming the SH line. Tanu means "young" as well as "the body". In the TF a Tibetan equivalent of "young" (gzhon nu) has been chosen, while the TS renders tanu by sku (body). According to the Tib.-Skt. dictionary ed. by Bacot ẖjam pa = koma[la], and mñen pa = komalaṃ.

Note 24.

Very many representations of Avalokita show the saint wearing an

antelope skin, which covers his left shoulder and a part of his left arm. In view of this fact I translate kara by "arm". Compare B. Bhattacharyya's Indian Buddhist Iconography (Oxford University Press 1924), plate XX. The corresponding lines of the TS and the TT are the following:
nu ma g'yon du ri dags pags pas ṅes par bkab (TS)
ri dvags pags pas nu ma g'yon pa bkab pa po (TT).

The syllable g'yon, which we find in both texts supports my emendation vāma° (instead of Fa T'ien's vāsa°).

Note 25.

A fairly exact counterpart to line 19 of the KFT is found in the following line of the TT:
sñan cha gdu bus sgeg ciṅ rgyan rnams ẖchaṅ pa po.

I regard it as certain that the original Skt. line had the following meaning: whose ears, which listen to everybody, are adorned with beautiful ear-rings. If we could change dharaṃ into karṇaṃ we would obtain this meaning, but karṇaṃ does not fit into the metre. Under these circumstances it may be permissible to suggest that lola is short for lolakarṇa(u) "ears which are flexible (i. e. which listen to everybody)". According to Monier-Williams' dictionary [the Bahuvrīhi-compound] lolakarṇa occurs in the Rājataraṅgiṇī and means "listening to everybody". Avalokita's ears are certainly lola, because he is known as the great compassionate one (mahākāruṇika).

Note 26.

The TS line dealing with Avalokita's navel is the following:
lte baḥi gnas ni chu skyes dkar po daṅ mç̣huṅs çiṅ.

In the TT (as in the TF) two lines correspond to line 20 of the KFT:
dri ma med paḥi padmoḥi mchog la gnas pa po
lte baḥi ṅos ni padmaḥi ẖdab ltar ẖjam pa po.

The Narthang ed. has padma bde mchog ẖbyuṅ instead of padmoḥi mchog la gnas. The syllables kamaladala (padmaḥi ẖdab), which the Sanskrit original of the TT seems to have had, do not fit into any Toṭaka line.

According to Monier-Willams' dictionary, tala = talla, and talla, according to the GPW, means "Loch".

Note 27.

Fa T'ien has probably mistaken dharaṃ for varaṃ, comp. note 17 above. In the corresponding lines of the TS and of the TT we find the syllable h̤zin [dharaṃ].

Note 28.

I have already pointed out that Fa T'ien treats the syllable jñă as if it was composed of g plus yă. Here as well as in lines 49 and 63 of the Mañjuçrīnāmāṣṭaçataka he uses 誐 plus 也 in order to render jñă. 誐 generally represents gă or g in Fa T'ien's transliterations and 也 stands for yă. Comp. lines 8, 12, 15, 16, 18, 24, 25, 29 and 30 of the KFT, and Bibl. Buddh XV, pages IV, V, 174 and 187. In connection with Fa T'ien's treatment of the syllable, which we generally render by jñă, it should be pointed out that that syllable is pronounced gyă in many parts of modern India.

Line 23 of the KFT is metrically incorrect. The second syllable of a Toṭaka line should be short.

The Coni Tanjur version of the TT contains the following line:

thub paḫi mkhyen paḫi mcho chen pha rol phyin pa po,

which seems to be founded upon the reading munijñāna etc. Instead of thub paḫi the Narthang Tanjur has dgaḫ ba (?).

Note 29.

I think that the original of line 24 contained two attributes belonging to Avalokitanāthavaraṃ (l. 4): bahupuṇyam and upārjitaramyapadaṃ. The Chinese transliteration is certainly faulty. Even if we regard 母波阿里嚩二合多 as a correct rendering of mupārjita (not of mupa arjita), we must have recourse to an emendation in order to obtain 12 syllables (not 13). 囉摩也二合 would be a correct transliteration of ramya. We must assume that the note 二合 has been erroneously omitted and that 馱 has taken the place of 也 (or of 野) owing to the negligence of a scribe. This is not the only line of our hymn, where the note 二合 has been omitted. The reading carma (pags pa) in line 18 is quite certain, and in order to obtain it, we must read 左里摩二合 instead of 左里摩. 左里摩 (without the note 二合) would be a correct transliteration of carima.

Comp. line 98 of the Gaṇḍistotragāthā (Bibl. Buddh. XV, 49), where the sārvajña(ṃ) pada(m) acquired by the Buddha is qualified by the adjective surucira(ṃ). Dr. Johnston (Ind. Ant. LXII, 69) translates sārvajñaṃ padam..... suruciraṃ by "blissful stage of Omniscience". Bsod nams du ma is evidently a translation of bahupuṇya, but the rest of the TF line must be founded upon a different Sanskrit text. The more or less corresponding lines of the TS and the TT are:

bsod nams maṅ po ñe bar bsags paḫi phyag mthil can (TS)
mchog brñes bsod nams maṅ pos ñe bar bsags pa po (TT).

Note 30.

Line 25 is metrically incorrect. The second syllable should be short. The original version of the line may have had jvararoga etc. which would be metrically correct. Tib. nad may represent Skt. roga as well as Skt. vyādhi.

Note 31.

The TF and the TS (srid gsum mthar mṭad) seem both to be founded upon the reading tribhavāntakaraṃ, doing away with the three forms of existence, i. e. leading to Nirvāṇa, but the reading of the KFT (tribhavārthakaraṃ) is also admissible. In the Mahāvaṃsa (Geiger's ed., Pali Text Society 1908, page 27) we find the following words: tibhavahitakarānaṃ lokanāthorasānaṃ. In Geiger's translation (Pali Text Society 1912, page 25) these words are rendered by "of the sons of the Universal Teacher,..... who had conferred blessings on (the beings of) the three forms of existence".

Three syllables are evidently missing in the Chinese transliteration. The Roman letters supplied by myself to fill the gaps are supported by the TF, which has mkhaḫ la rgyu ba daṅ (mkhaḫ=suvarga, rgyu ba=caraṃ, and daṅ=ca).

Between the lines srid pa etc. and bdud rigs etc. the TF inserts the line

kun tu rgyu baḫi sku mchog la bstod pa,

which has no counterpart in the KFT.

Note 32.

The more or less corresponding lines of the TS and of the TT are the following:

SOCIETE ASIATIQUE 1822

pha rol phyin bcu bdud kyi stobs las ṅes par rgyal (TS)
lus can mchog ste bdud dpuṅ ḫkhrugs las rgyal ba po (TT).

The TS line seems to be a translation of the following Skt. line:

daçapāramitājitamārabalaṃ,

who defeated Māra by means of the ten transcendental virtues. The compound vividhākula, an exact equivalent of which we find in the TF (rigs sna çhogs), does not fit into our Toṭaka line and yields no satisfactory meaning. Therefore I read vividhākula°, and translate the compound thus: "in many encounters" (vividheṣv ākuleṣu). According to Böhtlingk's dictionary, ākula n. means "Verwirrung". The hypothesis that ākula in addition to "confusion" may mean "battle" or "encounter" is supported by the fact that saṃkula n. frequently occurs with the meaning "Schlachtgetümmel". Comp. the GPW vol. VII, page 522. 尾尼駄引倶羅 would be the perfectly correct transliteration of vividhākula, but the note, indicating that the preceding character represents a long (引) syllable, is very frequently missing in Fa T'ien's transliterations. Comp. line 30 of the KFT, where 摩賀 (without 引) certainly represents mahā (chen po), and note 9 above.

The Harvard University copy of the Narthang Tanjur seems to have ris sna çhogs instead of rigs sna çhogs (Coni).

Note 33.

We learn from line 29 that Avalokita's gait resembles the tread of an elephant as well as the carriage of a Haṃsa. Comp. expressions like gajagati, gajavraja, haṃsagati and haṃsagamana, all of which imply compliments. According to Monier-Williams' dictionary haṃsavāraṇagāminī means: a woman who walks like a swan and young elephant.

The corresponding lines of the TS and TT are the following:

glaṅ po rnam par rçen pa dag daṅ ṅaṅ paḫi ḫgros (TS)
ṅaṅ paḫi ḫgros daṅ glaṅ chen dregs ḫdrar gçegs pa po (TT).

The Narthang Tanjur has gzigs instead of gçegs (Coni). Fa T'ien has evidently read gajamanta° (not gajamanda°). The TF and the TT lines may be incorrect translations of gajamatta etc. According to the Mahāvyutpatti (Sakaki ed., N° 7344), mattah (sic) = dregs pa. The roots raṃb and laṃb are closely related, and I think that the word viraṃbita may be taken as an equivalent of vilaṃbita (= rnam par rçen pa?).

Note 34.

The two-handed form of Avalokita, which is praised in this hymn, is white on all the pictures, which I have seen. Comp. Grünwedel in Bibl. Buddh., vol. VI, part I, page 126.

This line is metrically incorrect. The second syllable should be short.

The TF line gser bzhin etc. is entirely different in meaning from line 31 of the KFT. I give it here merely because we find it in the Tanjur between the lines bdud rçi etc. and ri bo gru ḫzin etc.

Note 35.

Potala or Potalaka is frequenty mentioned in Buddhist books as the home of Avalokita. According to some, Potalaka is an island, according to others, it is a mountain, and at least one text describes it as an "island mountain" Comp. Watters, On Yuan Chwang etc., vol. II, page 231. Our sources do not agree as to whether Potalaka is situated in the North, or in the South of India. The Sung Kao Sêng Chuan knows of a Mount Potalaka (補陀落伽), the palace of Avalokita, situated near the native country of a historical personage from *South* India (the Çramaṇa Vajrabodhi, VII—VIII cent. A. D.). Comp. the Tōkyō Meiji Trip. vol 致, fasc. 4, page 70b, Eitel's Hand-Book, Tōkyō 1904, pages 118-119, and Professor Takakusu's article on Kwan-Yin, Hastings' Encycl., vol, 7, page 765.

The reading çrīpotalakādhi° is metrically incorrect. The TF seems to be founded upon the reading giripotalakādhi°, which fits into our Toṭaka line. The following is the corresponding TS line:

dpal ldan po ta la yi gnas su ṅes bzhugs te.

Note 36.

The saint, to whom our hymn is addressed, bears a variety of names. Most western authorities call him Avalokiteçvara, but in Tibet he is generally known as Spyan ras gzigs, which name is a translation of Avalokita (not of Avalokiteçvara). The Sanskrit text of the Bodhicaryāvatāra (ed. de la Vallée Poussin, page 66) too designates him as Avalokita. Among his Chinese names we find 觀音 [Avalokitasvara], 觀世音 [Avalokitalokasvara], 觀自在 [Avalokiteçvara], 觀世自在

[Avalokitalokeçvara], and even 觀世音自在 [Avalokitalokasvareçvara, Mahāvyutpatti, Sakaki ed., N° 645]. The name Avalokitalokeçvara is also used in Nepal, and the name Avalokitasvara occurs in Sanskrit manuscripts found in Central Asia. Comp. Bhattacharyya's Indian Buddhist Iconography, page 182, and Mironov's Buddhist Miscellanea, (JRAS for 1927). Professor de la Vallée Poussin thinks "that before becoming Śiva, Avalokiteśvara was a Bodhisattva, and, as such, was named Avalokita". Comp. Hastings' Encyclopaedia, vol. II, page 257.

Note 37.

I omit lines 12, 13 and 14 in my translation, because I have not succeeded in reconstructing the Sanskrit text of them satisfactorily. Comp. notes 19 and 20 above. The Chinese characters, which form line 13 of the KFT are a correct transliteration of the Skt. compound prathamāruṇaraṃjitarājasamaṃ, "resembling a King, on whom the rising sun shines". This may refer to Avalokita's halo. Neither the TF, nor the TS, nor the TT have anything, which reminds us of rājasamaṃ.

Note 38.

The ear-rings (kuṃḍala) and most of the other ornaments, mentioned in the KFT, are clearly visible on the statuettes of Avalokita, represented on plates I and II below, The statuette represented on plate I is 21 inches high and bears no inscription. The statuette represented on plate II is 11 inches high, and a Sanskrit inscription engraved upon its pedestal says: [This statuette of] the Lord of the world has been ordered by Çūrabrahman for the purpose of assuring [a rebirth in] paradise to his brother Candrabrahman (Çūrabrahmaṇā nijabhrātuç Candrabrahmaṇaḥ Sukhāvatyāṃ prāptaye kārāpito Lokanāthaḥ).

The image of the Buddha Amitābha, mentioned above (note 15), which sometimes rests on Avalokita's knot of hair (plate II), is generally worked into the saint's crown (plate I). The antelope skin is, curiously enongh, missing on both statuettes. Comp. line 18 of the KFT.

Note 39.

The characters used in the title of the KFT and in the purely Chinese line, as well as the characters 梵讚第 — etc. (comp. note 7 above) are equally ignored in my list.

Note 40.

As far as I know, the only Chinese book, in which Skt. ya is rendered by 曳 (accompanied by the note 移結) is the 翻譯名義集, where 曳 represents ya in Yaṣṭivana (comp. Taishō Trip., vol. 54, page 1102b, line 1), but this statement of the 翻譯 etc, is evidently based upon a misprint. Hsüan Tsang's Hsi Yü Chi, which is quoted by the 翻譯 etc. in the passage referred to, has 洩 (not 曳) in the transliteration of Yaṣṭivana (comp. Taishō Trip., vol. 51, page 920a, line 7), and the Taishō editors tell us only in a foot-note that there is a reading: 曳. The characters 爾曳二合 represent jye according to the Indian letters, which we find next to 爾曳二合 in an invocation of the Medicine-Buddha. Comp. Tōkyō Meiji Trip., vol. 餘, fasc. 1, page 29b, line 5, Taishō Trip., vol. 19, page 22a, lines 8 and 9, and the 續藏經, 輯 N° 1, 套 N° 3. 册 N° 1, page 33b 下, lines 11 and 12. In the last-named edition the Indian letters are not as clearly readable as in the other two editions. According to Eitel's Handbook (Tōkyō 1904, page 206) Yachṭivana = 洩瑟知林. The Taishō Trip. (vol. XIX, pages 100–105) contains two versions of a dhāraṇī, the shorter title of which is: 大佛頂大陀羅尼. One of the versions gives us the text in Indian characters, and the other one in a Chinese transliteration dating from the VIII century (Amoghavajra). The characters 曩謨婆誐嚩帝舍引枳也二合牟曩曳[NB]怛他誐哆耶阿囉訶二合帝穆藐穆母馱引耶 of the transliteration correspond to the words namo bhagavate Çākyamunaye [NB] tathāgatāyārhate samyaksaṃbuddhāya of the text written with Indian characters. The Tibetan counterpart of the 大佛頂大陀羅尼 also contains an exact equivalent of the words namo bhagavate Çākyamunaye tathāgatāyārhate samyaksaṃbuddhāya (bcom ldan ḥdas de bzhin gçegs pa dgra bcom pa yaṅ dag par rẓogs paḥi saṅs rgyas Çākya thub pa la phyag ḥcḥal lo). Comp. the A. D. 1692 Kanjur, vol. PHA, page 257b, lines 3 - 4, and pages 83—84 of the Ōtani Kanjur catalogue.

Note 41.

Professor Maspero's quotation of the text, on which he bases his reconstruction, is not quite correct. On page 52a (line 13) of the fasciculus (Tōkyō Meiji Trip. vol. 成, 5), referred to by him, we find the following group of characters 囉 [not 薩] 婆提婆多引阿 [not 引 only] 吠重色訖底. The sūtra, in which they occur, is the 佛說隨求即得

大自在陀羅尼神呪經. The Tibetan counterpart of this Chinese version bears the following Tibetan title: Ḥphags pa [sic] rig sṅags kyi rgyal mo so sor ḥbraṅ ba chen mo, and contains a translation (not a transliteration) of the passage, in which the word sarva° occurs. The Tibetan counterpart of the characters 嚕婆 etc. is: lha thams cad kyis dbaṅ bskur ba la. Comp. the A. D. 1692 Kanjur, vol. PHA, page 125a, line 7, and page 76 of the Ōtani Kanjur catalogue.

Note 42.

Forms of the root muc plus abhi rarely occur in Sanskrit books, and are unlikely to form part of Buddhistic invocations. Therefore the word 'bhimukte (BEFEO XX, page 27) attracts our attention. If the author of the treatise had consulted the Kanjur, he would probably have come to the conclusion that the correct reconstruction of 毗 etc. is vimukti (not 'bhimukte). In the Kanjur counterpart of the Indo-Chinese passage (阿上弩伽囉訶達迷六毗目去底二合達迷七), which contains the characters 毗 etc., we find the words anugrahadharme / vimugtidharme [sic]. Comp. the A. D. 1692 Kanjur, vol. PHA, page 309a, lines 6—7, and page 97 of the Ōtani Kanjur catalogue. I have carefully examined pages 44a sqq. of fasc. 4 of volume 閏 of the Tōkyō Meiji Trip., which, according to Prof. Maspero, contain the expression 毗目帝, without finding it. I suppose that the expression 毗目帝 (instead of 毗目去底二合, Tōkyō Meiji Trip., vol 閏, fasc. 4, page 44b, line 6) has found its way into the treatise owing to the negligence of a printer. These and many other mistakes, such as 索 (instead of correct 素), page 28, line 4, and 虞 (instead of correct 麌), page 30, line 8 (guhya), have, however, not been rectified at the end of the treatise (Erratum, pages 121—122).

Peking, December 20th 1934.

PLATE I.

A bronze statuette of Avalokita.

觀音菩薩之銅像